

# Interview Summary

Application No.

10/656,874

Applicant(s)

EISENDRATH ET AL.

Examiner

Brian P. Whipple

Art Unit

2152

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Brian P. Whipple.

(3) Kenny Lin.

(2) Rob Devoto.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 08 November 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Zhao (U.S. Patent No. 6,035,404), Omshehe et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/069172 A1).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The general nature of the invention as described in the specification and viewed by the applicant was discussed. A focus on the "type of connection" of various users was the emphasis of much of the discussion and the proposed amendment. The proposed amendment to claim 1 was discussed to gain feedback on whether or not such an amendment would further differentiate claim 1 over the prior art used (Zhao and Omshehe). Agreement was reached that the proposed amendment as presented would overcome the prior art rejection of claim 1 under Zhao and Omshehe. Further clarification was sought regarding the final limitation of claim 1, but no agreement on a proposed amendment to the final limitation was reached. Further consideration of the claims over the prior art will be considered once an official version of claim amendments and/or arguments are received.